



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,287	05/25/2001	Eiji Yamakawa	15162/03680	4612
24367	7590	11/18/2003	EXAMINER	
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP 717 NORTH HARWOOD SUITE 3400 DALLAS, TX 75201			KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2675	7	
DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/866,287	YAMAKAWA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Srilakshmi K. Kumar	2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The following office action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed August 25, 2003.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al (US 5,748,277) in view of Nomura et al (US 6,236,385).

As to independent claim 1, Huang et al disclose a method for driving a liquid crystal display by applying AC pulses to a liquid layer through a plurality of scan electrodes and a plurality of data electrodes which face and cross each other (matrix), in which the scan electrodes are selected for scanning successively at specified time intervals (Figs. 1, 2A and 2B, col.2, lines 55-62), said method comprising; a reset step of applying a reset pulse (the preparation step/phase shown by Huang), which is to reset liquid crystal of the liquid crystal layer to a predetermined state, to an area of the liquid crystal layer that corresponds to a selected one of the scan electrodes (col. 3, lines 42-46, col. 5, lines 58-63, col. 8, lines 8-25, 38-44); a selection step of applying a selection pulse, which is to select a final state of the liquid crystal, to the area of the liquid crystal after the reset step (col. 3, lines 47-54, col.9, lines 40-42); wherein a pulse applied to the selected one of the scan electrodes during the reset step has an amplitude which is larger than a maximum amplitude of pulses applied to each of the data electrodes and has a polarity

maintaining period which is longer than that of the selection pulse so that the reset pulse has an alternating cycle which is longer than that of the selection pulse (col. 3, lines 42-46, col. 5, lines 58-63, col. 8, lines 8-25, 38-44). Huang et al do not disclose wherein a polarity maintaining period is longer than that of the selection pulse so that the reset pulse has an alternating cycle which is longer than that of the selection pulse. Nomura et al disclose this feature in Figs. 9A and 9B, and in col. 15, lines 20-45. In Figs. 9A and 9B, the pulse in T1, the reset period, is shown to have a longer amplitude than the pulse of the selection periods that follow. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the pulses of Nomura et al into that of Huang et al as the system of Nomura et al, in col. 2, lines 51-59, shortens the write time and prevents flickering of the display.

As to independent claim 9, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, an evolution step of applying an evolution pulse, which is to select a final state of the liquid crystal to an area of the liquid crystal layer (col. 3, lines 55-65, col. 10, lines 7-20) and wherein a pulse applied to the selected one of the scan electrodes during the evolution step has an amplitude which is larger than a maximum amplitude of pulses applied to each of the data electrodes and has a polarity maintaining period which is longer than that of the selection pulse, so that the evolution pulse has an alternating cycle which is longer than that of the selection pulse (col. 10, lines 7-20).

As to independent claim 16, limitations of claims 1 and 9, and further comprising, wherein, Huang et al disclose a liquid crystal display device comprising; a plurality of scan electrodes and a plurality of data electrodes crossed over the scan electrodes (col. 5, lines 53-57); and a liquid crystal layer sandwiched between the scan electrodes and the data electrodes, said

Art Unit: 2675

liquid crystal layer including liquid crystal (col. 2, lines 55-62); and a driver which is connected to the scan electrodes and to the data electrodes (col. 5, lines 13-16).

As to independent claim 24, see limitations of claims 1, 9 and 16, above.

As to dependent claims 2 and 3, see limitations of claim 9, above.

As to dependent claims 4, 19 and 26, limitations of claims 1, 16 and 24, and further comprising, wherein the polarity inversion cycle of the reset pulse is sufficiently long to prevent the liquid crystal from being polarized (col. 3, lines 42-46, col. 5, lines 58-63, col. 8, lines 8-25, 38-44).

As to dependent claims 5, 12, 20 and 27, limitations of claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, and further comprising, wherein the time intervals to select the scan electrodes successively are determined based on a time defined by the selection pulse (col. 4, lines 28-33).

As to dependent claims 6, 13, 21 and 28, limitations of claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, and further comprising, wherein the maximum amplitude of the pulses applied to each of the data electrodes is lower than a threshold to change the state of the liquid crystal (col. 4, lines 20-28).

As to dependent claims 7, 14, 22 and 29, limitations of claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, and further comprising, wherein the liquid crystal exhibits a cholesteric phase having a selection reflective characteristic (col. 2, lines 55-62).

As to dependent claims 8, 15, 23 and 30, limitations of claims 7, 14, 22 and 29 and further comprising, wherein the liquid crystal exhibits bistability between a planar state and a focal-conic state (col. 3, line 55-col. 4, line 33).

As to dependent claim 10, see limitations of claim 1, above.

As to dependent claim 11, limitations of claim 9, and further comprising, wherein the polarity inversion cycle of the evolution pulse is sufficiently long to prevent the liquid crystal from being polarized (col. 10, lines 7-20).

As to dependent claims 17 and 25, limitations of claims 16 and 24, and further comprising, wherein the AC pulses further comprise an evolution pulse, which is to cause the liquid crystal to evolve to a selected final state, to the area of the liquid crystal layer during an evolution step that is subsequent to the selection step (col. 3, lines 55-65, col. 10, lines 7-20).

As to dependent claim 18, see limitations of claim 9, above.

*Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Srilakshmi K. Kumar** whose telephone number is (703) 306 5575.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Art Unit: 2675

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703 305 47000377.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srilakshmi K. Kumar whose telephone number is 703 306 5575. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven J. Saras can be reached on 703 305 9720. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872 9314 for regular communications and 703 308 9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 4700.

Srilakshmi K. Kumar  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2675

SKK  
November 9, 2003



STEVEN SARAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600